to a cursor and then activated according to the performance or non-performance of cursor control events and a predetermined time interval. Chow merely provides for monitoring mouse activity and parking a cursor at a specific GUI location if there is no mouse activity for a predetermined period of time. Indeed, as described at col. 2, l. 66 to col. 3, l. 5 of Chow, if a mouse event does not happen for a predetermined amount of time, the cursor is moved to a predetermined desktop location. Chow provides no means for assigning a cursor tool to a cursor nor activating the cursor tool according to cursor control events. In contrast, claim 1 provides for assigning a cursor tool to a cursor and then activating the cursor tool according to the performance or non-performance of cursor control events. Therefore, independent claim 1 is patentable over Chow under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Because independent claim 1 is allowable, dependent claim 15 is also patentable over Chow under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

The Examiner also rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Chow. As explained above, Chow does not teach a scheme wherein a cursor tool can be assigned to a cursor and then activated according to the performance or non-performance of cursor control events. Claim 16, however, specifically recites such features. Therefore, claim 16 is patentable over Chow under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Because claim 16 is allowable, dependent claims 16-24 are also allowable over Chow under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

The Examiner also rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Chow. For the reasons provided above claim 25 is patentable over Chow under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Because claim 25 is allowable, dependent claims 26-28 are also allowable over Chow under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

## II. 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 3, 17, 18, 26, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chow. With regards to independent claims 1, 16, and 25, Chow does not teach or suggest a scheme for activating a cursor tool assigned to a cursor according to the performance or non-performance of a mouse down event and a mouse up event. Claims 2, 3, 17, 18, 26, and 27 specifically recites such features. Therefore, claims 2, 3, 17, 18, 26, and 27 are patentable over Chow under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 2002

Tarek N. Fahmi

Reg. No. 41,402

12400 Wilshire Boulevard Seventh Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025 (408) 720-8300